



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

How little have the rulers of our day profited by the lessons of history. The late Secretary of the Navy advocated the increase of the American navy to an equal place with the most formidable sea power of the world. Great Britain launches the *Dreadnaught*, and Congress is immediately besieged and implored to appropriate the millions necessary to build a larger and more destructive monster. France follows in the same direction, and Germany sets her builders at work to eclipse all others. It is high time the peace-loving people of America should call a halt in our naval expenditures. We have the authoritative statement of the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the present Congress, made in the House only a few days ago, *that the appropriations for the navy by the last two Congresses amounted to \$388,108,715, or more than twice as much as it would cost to build the Panama Canal; that we are expending for the current fiscal year \$375,659,719 for military purposes, or sixty-four per cent of the total expenses of the government; and that as a consequence no appropriations can be made for the necessary demands of commerce in river and harbor improvements and for public buildings, or the people must have new taxes levied upon them to meet these enormous war expenditures. Such being the issue, the discussion of the limitation of our armament is likely to pass from the peace societies to the over-burdened taxpayers. Our legislators, who have been deaf to the appeals of the friends of peace and arbitration, may meet a reckoning at the ballot-box.

I would not have you understand that I am advocating peace at any price. If you will excuse a personal allusion, I will say that I have given nearly four of the best years of my life to active military service in the greatest war of modern times. I believe with President Roosevelt, as expressed in his message already quoted, that there have been, and may be in the future, righteous wars, and I would, as he expressed it, "follow the path which leads towards righteousness, even though that path leads to war." But I also believe that in the present stage of the world's progress most wars may be avoided, and if the powerful nations will unite in compulsory arbitration, all aggressive wars may be prevented. I also believe that the measure next to, if not equal in importance with, compulsory arbitration, to secure the world's peace is the limitation and diminution of the armaments of the great powers.

I must not close without making reference to the dark shadow which has passed over our country since we last met. In the death of John Hay, Secretary of State, peace and arbitration lost one of their stoutest and most influential champions. But the inspiration of his example and his words remain to strengthen our faith in the ultimate triumph of the cause so near his heart.

* Hon. James A. Tawney, Cong. Rec. Vol. 40, No. 128, p. 7311. May 19, 1906.

A Common International Consciousness and a Common International Life.

ADDRESS OF REV. LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D.

If the distinguished lawyers and jurists who are here present discover some errors in what I shall have to say respecting the development of law, I hope they will

temper their justice with mercy in their subsequent criticisms.

I think it was one of the fathers of the Revolution who said that the only light on the path of the future was that shed by the lamp of experience. What does the development of law in the individual and then in the community indicate respecting the future development of law which we are to look for and to hope for among the nations of the earth? Every act oft repeated becomes a habit; habit long continued becomes a second nature. Thus we, as individuals, grow into a subjection to the laws of our own nature which we have ourselves helped to make. But we are not, as the author of Omar Khayyam insists, billiard balls, knocked hither and yon without a word; on the contrary, we have an intelligence which is able to understand these laws, and a will which is able to modify them. We can see in what direction our habits are leading us, and then we can, if we will, change, or modify, or absolutely reverse them. And, finally, with these habits and with this intelligence to understand and apply the laws of our own nature that grow out of our habits, and this will to resolve to do the thing which our intelligence directs us to do, there is a power to execute that which our will has resolved.

The comparison of the individual to the state is at least as old as Plato. The state also has its personality; the state grows as an individual grows. First, there are customs; these customs, continued, come by-and-by to have the force of law. These laws, long continued and persisted in, become the second nature of the state; that is, its constitution. But the state has an intelligence to understand these laws, to interpret them and to apply them; not merely the intelligence of the eighty millions of individuals, but an organic intelligence,—a crystallized, central intelligence. That intelligence which understands and interprets and applies these laws is the court.

It is not merely the function of the court to determine questions at issue between individuals. It might almost be said that this is its minor function. Its chief function is to interpret the nature and order of development of the nation to itself. It has been well said that Chief Justice Marshall did quite as much in the forming of the United States Constitution, as we have it to-day, as was done by any of those who helped to frame it and signed their names to it. In our own time and in the last few years, I do not think it is too much to say that the Supreme Court of the United States has done as much to guide the nation in the new channels and the new life on which it is entering as Congress has done. The court is the intelligence of the community applied to the problem of its customs, its habits, its state or national life.

But this state has not only an intelligence to understand; it also has a will by which it can vary its customs, and this will is expressed through the legislature. As the courts are the intelligence to understand and apply, so the legislature is the will to enact and determine; and, finally, there is an executive force to put this will into effect.

Now in the development of our international life we can trace some of these successive stages that we see in the individual and in the community. At first every

nation was a pure individualist in its national capacity; it cared only for itself, absolutely indifferent toward all other nations, and the only international law was the law of the strongest, the only international code, every nation for itself. Nation made war against nation whenever it thought it could get anything by making war. The law of the wild beast of the forest was the law of the warring, contending nations. It was found inconvenient; it was found disadvantageous, and then, no matter how, there grew up gradually a moral development of man and the inhumanity of it was seen.

In the olden time, when prisoners were taken, they were killed, they were flayed alive, they were tortured; the pictures and emblems of this are on the old drawings, on the old inscriptions of the ancient world. But after a little, the conquering nation saw that it could do something better than flay prisoners alive; it could make slaves of them and set them to work. So slavery came as the product of war. It was better to make a man work for you than to flay him alive. Then it was discovered that a community could enrich itself more by not making its captives slaves, but by bringing them into the community and making them free men. Thus freedom took the place little by little of slavery.

So, without going into detail, international customs respecting the conduct of war grew up just as customs grow up in state, just as habits grow up in the individual. Then the intelligence of the separate nations began to see these customs, see what they meant, what they ought to mean, how they ought to be modified in order to do justice or to conduce to the welfare of the individual nation, and international questions were brought before state courts and the state court exercised its judgment on the international custom. But the intelligence of the different nations did not agree and their customs did not agree. If my memory serves me right, the courts of Great Britain hold that coal is not contraband of war; but the courts of Russia hold that coal is contraband of war. There is the custom and an intelligence applied to the custom, but not as yet a common intelligence unifying and harmonizing the custom everywhere. Now and again treaties were concluded in which there was some attempt made to adjust these customs and to bring about some kind of agreement.

Finally, as the last step in this progress of international unification, came the Hague Tribunal. This Tribunal was not merely a contrivance for putting an end to war, not merely a means for settling individual quarrels between this nation and that nation; but it had for its object, at all events, I think, in the minds of the greatest statesmen, something more,—it was to be the international intelligence of the civilized world, the organized expression of the thought of the civilized world respecting the justice and righteousness which one people owes to another people, one nation to another nation. It was the organized intellect and organized conscience of civilized humanity.

Now, what is the next step? Why, the next step is the organized will of the civilized community of nations. It is true that in the history of nations the executive has generally preceded the legislative, and that is because despotism preceded liberty. First you have a Cæsar or a Czar, later a legislative assembly. Because at first the

people have no intelligence, no organized intelligence, no organic will; they have a great many different wills and thoughts and opinions, but no organized intelligence, no organized will, and they are subject to the intelligence and the will of the imperial dictator, the Napoleon, the Cæsar, the Czar. But just as soon as the nation comes to national consciousness, just as soon as it begins to have a national will, it demands a legislature. Why? I suppose there is not a mother in this room that has not had the experience of a child organizing in himself a douma, and she has been just as much puzzled to know what to do with the child with a douma as the Czar of Russia is puzzled what to do with the Douma. And if I may be allowed to put in a parenthesis to the mothers, I advise you to adjust yourselves to the douma of the child and not to attempt to repress or destroy it. But that is in passing.

Just as soon as the nation begins to get a corporate intelligence it must have a court; just as soon as it begins to get a corporate will, it must have a legislature. Now we have already organized our corporate intelligence. It is here, and our next step is to bring to this corporate intelligence the problems of justice that perplex us, to settle them, not by our pride, not by our selfishness, but by our brain. When I say that the Supreme Court of the United States is the brain of the United States, I do not mean to say that all the brains of the United States are in the judges of the Supreme Court; nor when I say that the Hague Tribunal is the brain of the civilized world, do I mean that all the brains of the civilized world are in the Hague Tribunal. What I mean is this: if the community is to act as an organism, it must have an organized thought, and if the civilized world is to act as an organism it must have an organized court; and what the Supreme Court of the United States is,—the organ of the thought of the United States in its interpretation of the customs and the life of the nation,—such the Hague Tribunal is to the civilized world, the interpretation of the organic thought of the civilized world in relation to the problems of international justice and peace.

But having that, we must have the next thing, the organized will. We must have some organ by which, as the community acts as a community, so the nations of the world can act also as a community; and that is the International Parliament. We have had some tentative experiments in this direction. There have been congresses of the nations for one thing or another. Perhaps the most notable of these is the Postal Union Congress, which does not, indeed, have as yet legislative power, if I understand the facts aright. The Postal Union has no legislative authority to determine what shall be the postal laws of the different nations, but its recommendations, unless I am mistaken, have always been practically adopted. It is an advisory parliament on postal matters, representing not merely the intelligence, but the will of all the nations that are brought together through the post.

We have our Pan-American Congress, which as yet is not a permanent body, but which I think we shall learn here before this session is over is likely soon to become a permanent body, again representing not merely the intelligence and thought, but working toward an expression of the will of the people of all the Americas.

We have the Interparliamentary Union, which as yet

has had no official recognition, if my memory serves me right, from the different governments, although it is composed of persons that go from the different parliaments. The next step, now, is an official organization of that Interparliamentary Union, with advisory powers at first that shall become legislative powers in turn by and by.

First comes an organic intelligence of the nations, next an organic will of the nations, and next an organic executive power of the nations,—and less armament? Yes. How shall we determine how much less armament? Why, just as long as you have this conception that England must have her armies and navies to protect her interests, that America must have her army and navy to protect her interests, and France the same, just so long you will have more or less of competition between the contending nations, each determined at least to be strong enough to resist its neighbor if it is attacked. It may be that Russia is the only country that would object to less armament, but I suspect that so long as she objects, Japan will object too. Napoleon undertook to make all Europe one great empire without a national consciousness, without a national intelligence, or a national will, focussing all in his own brain. Europe not merely combined in intelligence, in law, in will, but it combined also in force, and it put force, the military forces of Europe, under the direction of a common leader to protect every nation from the one whom they regarded as the foe of all the nations. The Boxer movement threatened representatives of every nation. We did not send to their relief a Japanese force under a Japanese commander, a German force under a German commander, an English force under an English commander, and an American force under an American commander; we said, "Here is police duty to be done," and the police forces were put under one man and marched to Peking,—English, German, French, and Japanese, under a German commander.

Here, as I take it, we are to dream dreams and see visions. The young men and the old men are to dream dreams and see visions. That is what we are at Lake Mohonk for, and so I make no apology or excuse whatever for saying what is my dream and my vision. It is this: The time is coming when all the military forces of the civilized world will be one police force, under one chief of police, with one international legislature, to decide what is the will of the nations, and with one international court to interpret the official and legal intelligence of the nations. There will be just enough army and just enough navy to make the world safe, under a common direction and a common control, and no more. [Applause.] To-day Europe is pretending to dread "the yellow peril." Possibly a few Europeans do, but I do not think any very sane ones do. China really does dread the white peril, and has reason to. How shall we obviate this difficulty? How shall we of the west avoid the yellow peril, and they of the east avoid the white peril? There are two ways: One way is, that we build up armies and navies and get ready for the worst war the world has ever seen; the other way is to say, An end to this way of settling difficulties. China, Japan, Russia, Europe and America,—we will have a common intelligence through a court; we will form a common will through an Interparliamentary

Union, and we will form a common chief of the police, call him what you will. This is the sane way. It is the righteous way. It is the way in which lies peace.

The world is moving very fast,—very fast. When Edward Everett Hale, in 1895, said here, "We want a permanent court of arbitration, a permanent tribunal," there were men on this floor, you remember, who said, "This is the dream of the dreamer, and the vision of the visionary." In four years we had it. It is pretty hard to keep ahead of God. Just now he is moving fast. He has run ahead of the chariot. He has girt up his loins and run rapidly. What we want to-day—well, what I want—is not a court merely to settle individual difficulties. We have got that already. Not merely a body of men is wanted to come together and consult on international matters, though we are going to have that. What I want to see is a common international consciousness and a common international life. The Psalmist said, "The kings of the earth take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed," and they certainly did. What we want is that the kings of the earth shall take counsel together for the Lord and for his anointed. Paul said, "The kingdom of God"—what is it? "Righteousness, peace and joy." What we want is a common international consciousness, interpreted by a common international tribunal, expressing itself in a common international will,—a parliament, enforced by a common international executive, that shall make for justice, for peace and for human welfare. [Applause.]

The Triumphs of Peace.

ADDRESS OF CARDINAL GIBBONS.

Nearly two thousand years have rolled by since the birth of the Prince of Peace, whose advent was announced by the angelic host singing, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of goodwill." Christ's mission on earth was to establish a triple peace in the hearts of men,—peace with God by the observance of his commandments, peace with our fellowmen by the practice of justice and charity, and peace within our own breasts by keeping our passions subject to reason, and our reason in harmony with the divine law. When looking back and contemplating the wars that have ravaged the Christian world during the last twenty centuries, some persons might be tempted at first sight to exclaim in anguish of heart that the mission of Christ has been a failure. My purpose, in the brief remarks which I shall make, is to disabuse the faint-hearted of this discouraging impression.

It is by comparisons and contrasts that we can most effectually gauge the results of Christian civilization. Let us compare the military history of the Roman Empire with the military record of our American Republic. In pagan Rome war was the rule, peace the exception. The temple of Janus in Rome was always open in time of war, and was closed in time of peace. From the reign of Romulus to the time of Augustus Cæsar, seven hundred years, the temple of Janus was always open except twice, when it was closed for six years. The United States has existed as a sovereign nation for about one hundred and twenty years, since the close of the Revolution. During that period we have had four wars: